DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 534 JC 030 046

TITLE	CalWORKs in California Community Colleges: An Academic Senate Perspective. Adopted Fall 2002.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	23p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Papers_Topic.htm.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; *Community Colleges; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Legislation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Employment; Job Skills; *Job Training; *Labor Force Development; Poverty Programs; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Education; *Welfare Recipients; *Welfare Reform; Welfare Services; Working Poor
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to increase awareness and understanding of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. The Academic Senate holds the view that welfare reform that focuses on "work first" tends to push participants into below-subsistence-level jobs and eclipses an emphasis on long-term education, making it more difficult to help people become self-sufficient in the long run. Additionally, California's chronic under-funding of teaching and support services in the community college has a direct impact on students who are enrolled in the CalWORKs programs. In addition to state funding cuts, Bush administration funding proposals would change CalWORKs programs in ways directly contrary to Academic Senate recommendations. An informal survey of CalWORKs programs in California community colleges was conducted in the fall and spring of 2002. Forty-three colleges responded to seven questions: (1) How many students are currently in your program? (2) How do you rate the success of the program? (3) How do you track that success? (4) What support is offered to students? (5) What hinders students' progress? (6) Do you have a program for student retention? and (7) Do you have regular contact with county staff, social workers? Detailed responses are included, as are recommendations for further policy. Appended are: Colleges Responding to Survey; and Academic Senate Resolutions on CalWORKs. (Contains 19 references.) (Author/NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 534

adopted **fall 2002**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R.M. Silverman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

JC030046

CALWORKS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: AN ACADEMIC SENATE PERSPECTIVE

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2001 - 02 Occupational Education Committee

Ian Walton, Chair, Mission College

Steve Brown, College of the Redwoods

Warren Carter, Golden West College

Mark Lieu, Ohlone College

Beth Regardz, Cabrillo College

Jane Thompson, Solano College

Shaaron Vogel, Butte College

adopted **fall 2002**

CALWORKS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: AN ACADEMIC SENATE PERSPECTIVE

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract 1

Introduction 1

Welfare-to-work Programs In California 2

- CalWORKs Legislation 2
- Academic Senate Positions on CalWORKs 2
- The Vulnerability of Welfare-to-Work Programs 4

Education as an Anti-poverty Strategy: Can Calworks Work? 6

Informal Survey of Calworks Programs 7

Conclusions and Recommendations 10

- Academic Senate Policy Level Recommendations 10
- Recommendations to Local Senates 10

Appendices 11

- Appendix A: Colleges Responding to Survey 12
- Appendix B: Academic Senate Resolutions on CalWORKs 13

Reference Sources 17

ABSTRACT

This position paper of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provides background and analysis to increase awareness and understanding of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. It points to the role of the program in the California economy and the important part played by the California community colleges. It also identifies both services and barriers that significantly impact students. This paper highlights the effectiveness of educational programs as a social policy tool to move welfare recipients into lifelong career ladders with sustainable wages. Program characteristics that promote this are identified and the results of an informal survey of CalWORKs programs in selected California community colleges are included. Academic Senate recommendations are made regarding state policy direction and also for implementation at the local college level by academic senates and faculty.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is to increase awareness and understanding about the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. It points to both the important role the program serves in the California economy and the effective part played by the California community colleges. Recommendations on how to enhance the usefulness of the program for students will emerge at both the state policy and local levels.

The Academic Senate considers both the CalWORKs Program and the federal legislation that frames and funds it to be fundamentally flawed in design and grossly under-funded. Current budget proposals promise to exacerbate this situation. Nevertheless, California community colleges are succeeding in helping many students to use education to escape welfare and to enhance their long-term career prospects. Local and national data show that well-designed educational programs can be effective instruments of just such social change.

The first section of this paper describes the federal and state legislation that has led to the California version of welfare reform, discusses the Academic Senate's concerns with the CalWORKs Program, and addresses the political vulnerability of welfare reform that has direct implications for the future of CalWORKs programs in the community colleges.

The second section includes evidence of the effectiveness of educational programs as a successful anti-poverty strategy that can move recipients from the welfare rolls into a career ladder that provides lifetime employment at sustainable wages. It includes practices identified by faculty as useful in some CalWORKs programs and cites literature on national trends.

The third section details the findings of an informal survey of CalWORKs programs in 43 California community colleges.

The paper concludes with recommendations both at the state policy level and at the local level for academic senates and faculty in general. In sum, the paper supports the view that colleges can empower welfare recipients to become effective, productive workers, citizens, and individuals who can discover and successfully ascend their chosen career ladder.

WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA

CALWORKS LEGISLATION

Fueled by political conflict and shifting perspectives on public support for anti-poverty programs at both the national and state levels, many attempts have been made to restructure the welfare system. In general, changes in federal legislation have been reflected by corresponding changes in state programs. In 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). Known as the "Welfare Reform Law," this act established the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. California state legislation followed in 1997 in the form of Senate Bill 1744 (Johnston), the Regional Workforce Preparation and Economic Development Act (RWPEDA). RWPEDA was designed to create an integrated system of workforce development that would include reform of the current system of welfare in California. The underlying philosophy held that providing effective workforce development would benefit everyone, as welfare rolls were reduced and the economy was stimulated.

Also in 1997, Assembly Bill 1542 (Ducheny) established the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids, or CalWORKs, Program. This legislation implemented for the State of California the welfare reform legislation required by both the 1996 federal PRWORA and the 1997 state RWPEDA acts. It forced many state agencies and county organizations to work together, and it officially identified the California Community College System as a major participant in providing "a coherent and integrated system of education and training linked to economic development" (Nussbaum, Johnson, Eastin, and Hatamiya).[1]

[1] For a detailed account of federal and state welfare reform legislation, see the paper of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Toward a Perspective on Workforce Preparation and Economic Development, adopted Spring 2002.

ACADEMIC SENATE POSITIONS ON CALWORKS

From the Academic Senate point of view, much of welfare reform has involved questionable social policy. For example, the focus on "work first" tends to push participants into below-subsistence level jobs and eclipses an emphasis on long-term education, thus making it more difficult to help people become self-sufficient in the long run. Nevertheless, the community colleges have worked with county administrations to serve CalWORKs recipients and have managed to produce a wide range of options that incorporate broad educational opportunities.

One of the Academic Senate's concerns has been with the fundamental social inequity that results from the state's differential funding mechanisms for its three systems of higher education. The state funding level for a student to attend community college is significantly lower than the state funding for the same student to attend either of California's two university systems. This results in chronic under-funding of teaching and support services to those very students who most need help. The most vulnerable of these students include many who are enrolled in CalWORKs programs.

In addition to this general inadequate college funding, CalWORKs students must contend with more specific obstacles. The CalWORKs Program imposes unrealistic work expectations that are not required of any other student groups. For example, while it is automatically assumed that study and preparation time is a necessary part of a four-year university student's workweek, CalWORKs prohibits counting such time as part of a student's required 32-hour workweek. CalWORKs students are also subject to narrow, discriminatory performance outcome measures that are not applied to students in other educational programs. For example, short-term salary increases in subsequent employment are a mandated measure of the success of CalWORKs graduates, even though such a criterion does not reflect the quality of education received in a college program and the resulting potential for future career growth. Nor does it reflect external economic factors over which

students have no control. Such expectations discourage students from engaging in "career ladders" that combine work and continuing education, and hence hinder their ability to achieve long-term self-sufficiency.

Time constraints are perhaps the major obstacle to participants in welfare-to-work programs. Under both federal (TANF) and state (CalWORKs) requirements, welfare recipients have an overall lifetime limit of 60 cumulative months of cash aid. TANF allows participants up to 24 months to receive education and/or training prior to finding and retaining a job. CalWORKs reduced this to 18 months with a county option to extend for an additional 6 months.

This means that students do not have sufficient time to complete educational programs, such as certificates or degrees, which would lead to sustainable wages. Moreover, welfare recipients must first be referred by county agencies, many of which require recipients to first search for work, and refer them to educational providers only when the job search fails. The practical effect of this requirement is that many recipients are several months into their program before starting any education.

These time limitations have frequently proved counterproductive to student success. The Academic Senate has adopted resolutions that propose an extension of the timeframe and has, in fact, passed many resolutions that address particular aspects of CalWORKs, or more generally to welfare reform. Specific issues highlighted in Senate resolutions include:

- Extension of the educational timeline for welfare recipients (Spring 1997);
- Recognition of Carnegie unit homework requirements (Fall 1997);
- Restoration of automatic 24 month entitlement (Fall 1997 and Fall 1998);
- Inclusion of education beyond initial training (Spring 1999);
- Recognition of the social consequences of economic inequity and support for opportunity through education (Fall 1999);
- Inclusion of study time in the 32 hours required for welfare-to-work activities (Spring 2000 and Spring 2001); and
- Opposition to CalWORKs funding reductions (Spring 2002).

[The most relevant CalWORKs resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate since 1997 are listed in Appendix B. The Academic Senate's complete resolution database is also available in searchable form at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us].

The Academic Senate is not alone in its view that CalWORKs is in need of improvement. A similar perspective is evident in the responses to a December 2000 survey by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Statewide Advisory Committee on CalWORKs, which includes coordinators from ten state regions plus other institutional representatives. This survey involved participants at the CalWORKs Partnership Conference 2000, and the results were shared at the corresponding CalWORKs Partnership Conference in December. (James, 2001).

The survey participants were asked to respond to two questions:

- What barriers do you face today when you try to meet the needs of CalWORKs students?
- What changes would you make to address these barriers if you were in charge of the re-authorization of laws at the federal and state levels?

The results of the survey revealed the following suggestions for change:

1. Provide more school time (extend time limits) for students so they may achieve self-sufficiency.
2. Allow more time when students face additional barriers (e.g., disability, language.)

3. Increase CalWORKs allocation and increase spending flexibility.
4. Change the federal TANF and food stamps laws (make work study income exempt).
5. Improve and coordinate assessments.
6. Resolve confidentiality and post-employments issues with Department of Social Services.
7. Provide student housing (for example, on-campus dormitories).
8. Allow study time to count toward work participation time.
9. Work toward consistency of information on both sides.
10. Mandate proactive case management.

More specific recommendations from the CalWORKs Statewide Advisory Committee included the following:

1. Suspend the time clock for one year upon completion of a welfare-to-work plan that includes participation in a community college CalWORKs Program to allow students time to complete a program that may prepare them for employment at a self-sufficient wage.
2. Work toward a federal legislative change during the Food Stamp Reauthorization to allow for disregard of income earned through a CalWORKs work-study program (just as income earned through a federal financial aid work-study program is disregarded.)
3. Request minor changes to the Budget Act regarding reports to the Governor, Legislature and Department of Finance.

These suggestions clearly identify the need for more flexibility and more comprehensive student support services. They reflect many of the findings reported in similar studies at the national level, and they echo the positions advocated in Academic Senate resolutions.

Finally, the Academic Senate supports the integration of career ladder concepts into all welfare-to-work programs as one innovative response to many of the above concerns. The career ladder concept is described in the 2002 Board of Governors document, *Ladders of Opportunity*. Of particular importance is an emphasis on bridge programs that incorporate basic skills preparation and broader general education into occupational education. Also important is attention to "soft skills," such as interview techniques, needed to successfully obtain and maintain employment, including special attention to the needs of English language learners. A hallmark of a career ladder approach is coordination among the many actors involved to ensure student success: county social service and workforce agencies, employers, community based organizations and community colleges. Such an approach is clearly consonant with the intent of CalWORKs legislation and would reorient social policy around ensuring that students are maximally prepared for future success.

THE VULNERABILITY OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS

An ongoing concern reflected in Academic Senate resolutions regarding CalWORKs and other similar programs to help the poor is the constant threat to program funding. The current budget crisis in California has made clear the vulnerability of such programs. For example, in his January 2002 budget proposal, Governor Gray Davis proposed massive cuts for community college categorical programs, including matriculation, professional staff development and CalWORKs. Many legislators and constituents at the April 2002 Community College Legislative Day in Sacramento spoke strongly in support of the CalWORKs Program. Testimonials to the importance and success of the program were featured. One CalWORKs student reported that if it had not been for CalWORKs, she would literally be dead. A heavy user of drugs in the past, this young woman had turned her life around; she attributed this reversal directly to the support and encouragement she had received from the CalWORKs Program. In Spring 2002, the Academic

Senate adopted several resolutions opposing cuts in CalWORKs funding.

As California Community College Chancellor Tom Nussbaum noted in his *Weekly Email Update* on March 4, "Taking away Matriculation funds and CalWORKs funds will take the heart out of two programs critical to student success." Chancellor Nussbaum further asserted, "It is a sad irony that the wage and employment data indicates that once a CalWORKs recipient student leaves school, her/his earnings increase 43% the first year and increase by 88% within three years" (Nussbaum).

Despite such vocal support for the CalWORKs Program, legislators largely upheld the proposed cuts in the final budget. In the officially adopted state budget for 2002-03, CalWORKs funding for the California community colleges was cut by $30 million dollars.

In addition to funding cuts at the state level, long-standing program values are under attack from a more ideological perspective at the federal level. Federal legislation proposed by the Bush administration in May of 2002 would negatively affect welfare programs and would change CalWORKs programs in ways directly contrary to Academic Senate recommendations. The proposals would, for example:

- Decrease state flexibility;
- Increase work requirements and penalties for students; and
- Fail to increase funding.

According to the *Washington Post*, the proposals would increase the goal for the proportion of welfare recipients who must hold jobs from 50% to 70% and would increase the required work hours from 30 to 40 hours per week. Additionally, "the measures would restrict the kinds of activities that count as work, eliminating vocational training and looking for a job" (Goldstein). The proposal would also divert $200 million a year in federal subsidies for states to "experiment with ways to 'promote healthy marriages'" (Goldstein). Analyses of the current versions of legislation are available at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities Website at http://www.cbpp.org.

According to David Carroll in an April 2002 article for the California Budget Project, the proposed TANF requirements will not work for California. According to this article,

> *If enacted, the new work requirements will reduce the flexibility of California and its 58 counties to develop programs that meet the needs of welfare recipients and effectively move them into the workforce. Moreover, the plan will greatly increase costs for states while providing no additional TANF or childcare funds.*

This last point, provision of adequate childcare, is one of the components routinely found to be part of effective programs (see informal survey results on page 7).

Additional discouraging news was recently reported by *The San Jose Mercury News*. The article's headline reads, "The White House wants to gut a technology training program for U.S. workers, spending the money instead to speed up paperwork for foreign workers" (Bjorhus). The Bush administration, the article says, would shift $138 million targeted for the training grants to speed up processing of foreign workers. The U.S. Government, according to the report, contends that the job-training program for Americans has not been effective. However, Harris Miller, President of the Technology Association of America, disagrees. He states that the training grants were never designed as a "quick fix" and that the training is a "major good for the economy and the public, and the U.S. workforce." Mike Curran, director of a local job-training program in Sunnyvale says, "the grants were not designed to immediately put people in high-tech jobs but on a career ladder that would lead to their doing so."

EDUCATION AS AN ANTI-POVERTY STRATEGY: CAN CALWORKS WORK?

Educational programs can be effective instruments of social change by guiding welfare recipients into career ladder paths and providing adequate support services as they transition from state assistance into lifelong employment at sustainable wage levels.

Some of the program components that help to achieve such success were identified in the Academic Senate's 2002 paper *Toward a Perspective on Workforce Preparation and Economic Development.* Conversations with program faculty revealed several colleges— Butte, Cabrillo, Lake Tahoe, Santa Rosa Junior College, and Ventura, for example—that were perceived to be especially effective in their efforts to transition people from welfare back to work. Their suggestions for addressing many of the needs and barriers described above include the following:

- Develop integrated and contextualized curriculum as needed.
- Invite counseling, discipline and general education faculty and One-Stop representatives to advisory committee meetings.
- Identify and disseminate effective practices for work-based learning.
- Combine efforts with all appropriate agencies without redundancy.
- Create opportunities for lifelong learning.
- Recognize and acknowledge that there is a sense in which all education is vocational, just as all vocational education includes general education skills.
- Provide integrated job placement services to students and industry.

The results of including such components in California community college programs are documented in a 2002 study, *How California's Community Colleges Help Parents Move from Welfare to Self-sufficiency* (Mathur), which highlights the economic outcomes for AFDC (Aid For Dependant Children)/CalWORKs recipients who attend community colleges. This study found the following:

- CalWORKs students employed year-round during their last year in college (1999-2000) increased their annual earnings by 42% after being out of college for one year;
- The more units that CalWORKs students complete, the greater their increase in earnings;
- CalWORKs students who take a majority of vocational courses have greater increases in median annual earnings than the average for all CalWORKs community college students;
- Even CalWORKs students who enter college without a high school diploma increase their earnings dramatically after exiting the program; and
- Median earnings grow faster among CalWORKs students who recently left college than they do for all students who recently exited.

Perhaps even more compelling than the data showing that CalWORKs programs truly are effective are the personal anecdotes and testimonials from individual students who have been in the programs. Among the many statements from community college students cited in Mathur's report is the following:

> *I cannot say enough about the CalWORKs Program. I would not have been able to make it through my educational program without it. The staff has been like a family to me. They have provided me with academic counseling, financial assistance, job assistance, and even an occasional word of encouragement when it was needed. I hope to one day help others the same way that they have helped me.*

Other similar comments can be found by visiting the Website for the Center for Law and Social Policy at http://www.clasp.org. A particularly compelling

collection of stories by CalWORKs students can be found in *Student Success Portraits*, published by the Chancellor's Office in October 2000.

At the national level, the same beneficial effect of education is clearly seen. In *Built to Last: Why Skills Matter for Long-run Success in Welfare Reform*, Martinson and Strawn, writing for the Center for Law and Social Policy in Washington, analyze the performance of TANF and discuss how it should work. Their report covers the old law, how it worked, and proposals for the upcoming reauthorization of TANF. The authors maintain that "TANF restrictions on education and training are at odds with recent research findings on the experiences of welfare recipients in the labor market and on the effectiveness of different welfare-to-work strategies." The report takes issue with the new TANF recommendations and points clearly to the need for vocational training and postsecondary education to produce additional earnings and job quality.

One study cited by Martinson and Strawn found that for every year of education, the worker would receive a 7% increase in wages. The authors point out that the most successful welfare-to-work programs are "those that have focused on employment but … (have) made substantial use of education and training, together with job search and other employment services." They point to a Portland, Oregon welfare-to-work program as an exemplary model in which "mixed services" are utilized to achieve substantial gains in both employment and salaries. This program substantially increased education (particularly postsecondary), and focused on individual needs and talents, enabling participants to obtain not simply entry-level jobs, but first steps on a productive career ladder. For example, they helped the recipients obtain a GED or upgrade specific skills, and they emphasized job quality and stability rather than focusing only on employment. Martinson and Strawn also point out that "the Portland program performed better than those with a 'one-size-fits-all' approach."

A principal feature of the Martinson and Strawn paper is its research-based recommendations concerning the reauthorization of future legislation on welfare reform. Research has clearly indicated, for example, that, if education is addressed in an individualized career ladder approach as it is in the Portland, Oregon model, the wages of participants increase. Yet, the "one-size-fits all" mentality continues to be recommended during TANF reauthorization proposals by many in Congress and the Bush Administration.

The most powerful feature of the Martinson and Strawn report is the compelling evidence that postsecondary education is successful in helping welfare recipients to move forward to meaningful employment. The Martinson and Strawn recommendations are consistent with long-standing Academic Senate positions, which share the premise that education is a sound investment in both the state economy and individual career satisfaction.

INFORMAL SURVEY OF CALWORKS PROGRAMS

In the fall and spring of 2002, an informal survey of CalWORKs programs in California community colleges was conducted. The goal was simply to gain some insight into the current CalWORKs Program with respect to its numbers, rates of success, tracking mechanisms and support offerings. It was further designed to gather perceptions on barriers that students face. Conclusions regarding all responses should be interpreted as examples from the 43 colleges that responded (see Appendix A), and not as representative samples of the programs in the system as a whole.

The following questions were asked:

1. How many students are currently in your program?
2. How do you rate the success of your program?

3. How do you track the success of your program?
4. What support is offered to students?
5. In your opinion, what hinders the progress/ completion of the program by the student?
6. Do you have a program for student retention?
7. Do you meet with county staff/have regular contacts with social workers?

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 1—HOW MANY STUDENTS ARE CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN YOUR PROGRAM?

The total number of students involved in CalWORKs programs varied widely among the colleges, from 15 to 3,000 students.

Number of Students	Number of Colleges
Less than 100	13
100 – 199	8
200 – 299	7
300 – 500	7
501 – 899	0
900 and above	4
Other	4

The "Other" category included no response, don't know, small amount of students, and many students.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 2—HOW DO YOU RATE THE SUCCESS OF YOUR PROGRAM?

Question No. 2 addressed the perception of success in the minds of those operating the programs. The question was open-ended, and responses ranged from "excellent" and "very successful" to "hard to answer." Of the 43 responses, 27 described their CalWORKs programs as "excellent (2)," "very successful (9)," "very good (7)," or "successful (9)." Three described their programs as simply "good." Six described their programs as "under review," "relatively successful," or "hard to answer." Seven responses were left empty or were unclear.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 3—HOW DO YOU TRACK THE SUCCESS OF YOUR PROGRAM?

In retrospect, it is apparent that this question was not clear to respondents. Some respondents addressed the actual process for tracking success, while others offered the criteria they used to measure success. Thirteen of the colleges used the first interpretation and indicated that they track success using an electronic database such as Access or File Maker Pro. Of the colleges that used the second interpretation, success measures included rates of graduation, placement, course completion, and transfer. Placement was the most common response with 13 colleges using this measurement. Six followed up on students informally with personal contact. Three colleges did not respond, and one indicated it did no tracking.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 4—WHAT SUPPORT IS OFFERED TO STUDENTS?

The survey asked about support services provided by the college to CalWORKs students. Examples of such services included books, childcare, transportation, school supplies, workshops, community referrals, and job search/employment referrals. The range of services varied somewhat with 38 of the colleges offering childcare, while only 20 offered transportation and school supplies. Thirty-six offered job search and employment referrals. Only 23 offered support to buy books. Thirty-eight colleges also indicated that they offered other services to CalWORKs students, such as affordable mental health counseling through the student health center, assistance in developing education plans, assistance in choosing a career with a future, legal advice, personal counseling, or in-house access to the Department of Social Services staff. Among other services mentioned were "clothes closet" or interview clothes, laptop computers for loan, holiday gifts, holiday meals, intersession courses focused on re-entry strategies, post-employment services, referrals for emergency food or shelter, referral to other on-campus student services, scholarships, support groups, tools or uniforms required by school or work, and vouchers for haircuts.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 5—IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT HINDERS THE PROGRESS/COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM BY THE STUDENT?

Responses to this open-ended question varied but might be grouped under the headings noted below; following each heading are samples of the different types of responses received.

1. BUREAUCRACY: Need to report to many different agencies, failure of bureaucratic agencies to make reimbursements in a timely manner, and failure of agencies to interpret the rules in a consistent manner;
2. HOME LIFE/HOUSING: Familial obligations, homelessness;
3. CHILDCARE ISSUES: Lack of childcare during night classes, lack of *quality* daycare, no daycare for ill children;
4. SUBSTANCE ABUSE/PHYSICAL ABUSE: Drugs/alcohol, domestic violence;
5. HEALTH/MENTAL HEALTH: Inadequate, expensive or unavailable services, personal crisis;
6. LEGAL PROBLEMS: Unaware of rights and responsibilities, problems with child support/ custody;
7. LEARNING DIFFERENCES: Unidentified learning disabilities, disabilities not identified early;
8. BASIC SKILLS/LANGUAGE: Lack of basic skills, unprepared for the rigors of college, limited English;
9. TRANSPORTATION: No personal transportation/no rural bus service, unreliable transportation;
10. UNSUITABLE RECOMMENDATION: Directed into a program of study that is unsuitable for some reason (e.g., uninteresting/too challenging/unrealistic expectations);
11. MONETARY PROBLEMS: Slow reimbursements, unexpected expenses, difficulty collecting child support; and
12. TIME CONSTRAINTS: Study time not calculated as part of the 32-hour work obligation, travel time not taken into consideration.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 6—DO YOU HAVE A STUDENT RETENTION PROGRAM?

While 29 colleges responded that they did have a student retention program, 13 responded that they did not. Given the range of responses to Question 5 on barriers, it is surprising that more colleges did not have a formal process for improving the retention of CalWORKs students.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION NO. 7—DO YOU MEET WITH COUNTY STAFF AND/OR HAVE REGULAR CONTACTS WITH SOCIAL WORKERS?

While 37 colleges responded in the affirmative, it was surprising that 2 colleges answered that they did not have regular contact and 4 colleges gave no response. One of the requirements of CalWORKs programs is that they work with social agencies.

In summary, the majority of those responding to the informal survey of CalWORKs programs indicated that their CalWORKs programs were successful, but they also saw room for improvement. The responses suggest that many government-funded programs include significant barriers to successful student completion, such as time constraints, inflexibility, and late distribution of payments. The responses further suggest that some colleges (and/or outside agencies) do not adequately supply students with necessary financial support for books, transportation, childcare, and related needs. In contrast, successful programs address a wide variety of these needs. Finally, the responses suggest that efforts to better retain students need to be addressed in some colleges.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper demonstrates that the Academic Senate's belief in the effectiveness of education as an anti-poverty strategy in welfare-to-work programs, such as CalWORKs, is echoed in many places. The issues and concerns raised by Academic Senate resolutions are apparent in the responses to the informal survey of CalWORKs programs, in the Chancellor's Office studies and in the national literature. Specific barriers to successful program completion, such as inflexible time limits and unrealistic work expectations, are noted on several occasions. Such restrictions hamper progress toward the ultimate goal of providing our most vulnerable students with lifelong career ladder opportunities and sustainable wages. Effective programs encompass a wide range of options that incorporate broad educational opportunities, including bridge programs from the basic skills level, and a broad variety of individually tailored support services. Such programs are a sound investment, with long-term benefits for both the career of the individual student, and the economy and general well-being of theState of California. With these conclusions in mind, we make several recommendations.

ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:

1. Recommend continued support of CalWORKs programs in California;
2. Support the rights of students to receive both job and academic skills in a "career ladder" environment;
3. Oppose the reductions in the CalWORKs programs reflected in the state's 2002-03 budget;
4. Oppose the use of narrow performance based outcome measures in the evaluation of CalWORKs programs;
5. Recommend the modification of CalWORKs programs to permit a longer total timeframe;
6. Recommend the inclusion of study, training and education time in the definition of work for CalWORKs students;
7. Oppose the proposed federal reauthorization changes that increase work requirements for CalWORKs students.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO LOCAL SENATES

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourages local academic senates to:

1. Oppose the reduction or closure of local CalWORKs programs;
2. Support the strengthening of local CalWORKs programs by integrating a "career ladders" approach;
3. Ensure the full participation of faculty in the design and implementation of CalWORKs programs at their college;
4. Ensure that curriculum for CalWORKs students responds to program timeline requirements but also maintains academic quality and integrity;
5. Ensure that faculty are involved in all support functions of CalWORKs programs, including student career workshops;
6. Urge that necessary logistical support be provided for CalWORKs students in areas such as financial aid, book support, childcare and transportation; and finally
7. Urge that faculty initiate efforts to improve retention levels for CalWORKs students.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: COLLEGES RESPONDING TO SURVEY

Listed below are the 43 colleges included in the informal CalWORKs survey results:

American River College
Bakersfield College
Barstow College
Butte College
Cabrillo College
Cañada College
Canyons, College of the
Citrus College
Compton College
Crafton Hills College
Cuesta College
Desert, College of the
East Los Angeles College
Feather River College
Foothill/De Anza College
Fresno City College
Fullerton College
Gavilan College
Golden West College
Grossmont College
Imperial Valley College
Irvine Valley College
Lake Tahoe College
Lassen College
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Angeles Valley College
Marin, College of
Mendocino College
Mira Costa College
Napa Valley College
Ohlone College
Porterville College
Redwoods, College of the
Saddleback College
San Diego Miramar College
San Francisco, City College of
San Joaquin Delta College
Santa Barbara City College
Sequoias, College of the
Solano College
Taft College
Ventura College
West Hills College

APPENDIX B: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS ON CALWORKS

spring 2002, 22.01

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose the proposed budget reductions in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs) Program as short-sighted and counter-productive; Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the continued provision of resources and support services to CalWORKs students; and Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the enhanced integration of the CalWORKs Program and regular community college programs to maximize student career-ladder success.

spring 2002, 22.02

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the faculty, students, administrators, staff, and college community to initiate letter-writing, fax, and telephone campaigns to inform legislators and the Governor of the importance of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs) programs in providing skilled workers to the economy of California; Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop talking points on CalWORKs to share with local academic senates, student senates, and comparable organizations serving college presidents, chief instructional officers, and chief student services officers to assist in the communication campaign to restore the CalWORKs cuts; and Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide sample letters to the Governor and legislators and frequent news releases to the local media to ensure maximum publicity about the damaging effects of the 90%cut in CalWORKs to students and colleges.

spring 2002, 5.06

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges deplore the draconian cut in CalWORKs funding of $58 million proposed by the Governor in his 2002-2003 budget released in January because of the destructive effects this 90% cut in the budget will have on the ability of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs) students to develop academic and job skills necessary for them to enter the workforce and earn a livable wage; Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Governor to reconsider the damaging effects of cutting the proposed 2002-2003 CalWORKs budget to only $15 million for childcare in view of the lifetime limit of five years that a person can receive assistance; Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge Governor Davis and the Legislature to restore the CalWORKs budget to the 2001-2002 level of $65 million; and Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide copies of the Chancellor's Office publication Student Success Portraits (October 2000) to the Governor and legislators to educate them about the role CalWORKs programs have played in moving community college students from welfare-to-work and thus becoming productive, tax-paying citizens.

spring 2001, 22.01

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the inclusion of study time, based on the Carnegie Rule, in the hours required for welfare-to-work activities for community college students in the CalWORKs Program.

spring 2000, 21.02

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges promote education as the primary option in the Welfare-to-Work state and federal legislation, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support AB 1233 (as of April 15, 2000) to include study time as a component of the required 32 hours of work activities (coursework).

spring 2000, 21.01

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges be identified as a primary resource for instructional development in the CalWORKs Program, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to involve their faculty in the CalWORKs implementation plan, and Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the CalWORKs coordinator at each college to present the college CalWORKs plan to its college academic senate for approval.

fall 1999, 22.03

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize the social consequences of economic inequality and the role for California community colleges in providing opportunity and access to a fair society, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Department of Social Services to reorient its philosophy to one of opportunity through education, and Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community College urge the Department of Social Services and the Chancellor's Office to work together to increase the number of participants referred to community colleges for education that will lead to opportunities to earn a meaningful wage and contribute to a democratic society.

fall 1999, 22.02

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to provide the field with strategies and guidelines for successfully accessing data tape matches, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Department of Social Services to cooperate in partnership with their local community colleges in order to ensure that services and program resources are available to economically disadvantaged students.

spring 1999, 9.04

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reaffirm its commitment to inclusion of both ESL instruction and CalWORKs (California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids) programs within our mission, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges continue to work with other faculty organizations to seek legislative consideration of an extension of the timeframe for CalWORKs students to pursue their education and legislative consideration to secure increased funding so that students can continue education beyond their initial training in order to pursue full career preparation for employment at a livable wage.

fall 1998, 20.02

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to seek changes in California's CalWORKs legislation to increase the work preparation plan completion time to 24 months as allowed by Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Chancellor's Office identify effective CalWORKs programs and share these programs with other colleges.

spring 1998, 17.01

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to write a position paper on good practices on the role of local academic senates in student preparation and success and student services in such areas as counseling, transfer centers, transfer alliance, EOPS, DSP&S, student equity (success), financial aid, health centers, tutoring, and components of matriculation and CalWORKs, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges immediately advise local academic senates of their duties and responsibilities in the area of student preparation and success and student services, as required by number 5 in the list of eleven academic and professional areas in Title 5 Regulations for strengthening local senates.

fall 1997, 9.12

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Board of Governors to authorize that noncredit courses and programs be reviewed and approved following the local curriculum process and without the need for the Chancellor's Office approval.

fall 1997, 22.01

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges promote education as the primary option in the welfare-to-work state and federal legislation, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges pursue legislation that allows: 1) additional time for program completion for those students who are nearly college- or training-ready and who need to address basic skills deficits, 2) additional time for program completion for those students pursuing degrees and certificates longer than the 18 months allowed by current state legislation, 3) all Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) recipients to be assessed and referred for training/education prior to mandating work placement, 4) one hour of classroom time to generate three hours of work credit following federal law regarding Carnegie Unit requirements. And Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Board of Governors to seek federal legislation that would change the TANF federal code to allow TANF recipients the option of pursuing a college education in a welfare-to-work plan.

fall 1997, 22.02

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to continue to inform local senate presidents of all issues relating to the community college's role in welfare reform, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to ensure that all regular curriculum procedures be followed in dealing with welfare reform issues at their colleges, and Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senate presidents to refuse to sign off on curriculum changes made in response to welfare reform unless the regular procedures and proper curriculum processes have been followed.

fall 1997, 22.03

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to hold districts and colleges accountable for the proper use of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and CalWORKs funding to target supplemental programs and services for TANF recipients rather than to supplant existing funds.

fall 1997, 22.04

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senate presidents to recognize the importance

of their signature or lack of it on the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs) application, and Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to be substantially involved in the development of that application, and Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that local senate presidents contact the Academic Senate if college CalWORKs applications are sent forward without their signatures.

spring 1997, 22.03

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge the Executive Committee to develop a welfare reform/ workforce preparation model that includes academic standards, support services available throughout the education and transition period, and an integration of services provided by the Department of Social Services, the Employment Development Department, and other local organizations which help community college students make a successful transition from welfare dependence to employment, and Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to present the model at the Spring 1998 Session for adoption and subsequent implementation in consultation with Board of Governors, the Legislature, and other appropriate groups.

spring 1997, 22.02

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Board of Governors to work with the Governor to identify additional monies, other than Proposition 98 funds, in his budget to address the expanded need for funds in the community college system created by welfare reform.

spring 1997, 22.01

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Board of Governors to work with the Legislature and the Governor to extend the educational time line for welfare recipients to a two-year program.

REFERENCE SOURCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. *Toward a Perspective on Workforce Preparation and Economic Development.* Sacramento, CA. Spring 2002. [Online] Available at <http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us>

Aroner, Dion. Speech for Center for Law and Social Policy Conference Call. Washington, DC. 9 February. 2001.

Bjorhus, Jennifer. "Tech Job Training May Be Cut in Favor or More H-1B Funding." *Mercury News.* San Jose, CA. 14 April. 2002. [Online] Available at: <http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/3066164.htm? template=content Modules/prints for>

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. *Ladders of Opportunity.* Sacr amento, CA. January. 2002. [Online] Available at <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/esed/other_resource_documents/ladders.pdf>

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, CalWORKs Unit. *Student Success Portraits.* Sacramento, CA October. 2000. [Online] Available at <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/calworks/attachments/studentsuccess.pdf >

California Department of Social Services. *California's Welfare-to-work Plan.* Sacramento, CA. 1 January. 1998. [Online] Available at <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/calworks/caworks.html>

California Employment Development Department. *Workforce Investment Act Overview.* Sacramento, CA. 1998. [Online] Available at: <http://www.edd.ca.gov/wiaind.htm>

Carroll, David. "Proposed TANF requirements do not work for California." *California Budget Project.* Sacramento, CA. 23 April. 2002. [Online] Available: at: http://www.cbp.org/2002/w020404.pdf

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. *Special Report Series – TANF Reauthorization.* Washington, DC. Spring. 2002. [Online] Available at: <http://www.cbpp.org/tanfseries.htm>

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. *TANF and CalWORKs: How California Spends the Money.* Washington, DC. August. 2001. [Online] Available at: <http://www.cbpp.org/2001/0108wel7.html>

Goldstein, Amy. "Two House Panels Back Welfare Law Changes". *Washington Post.* Washington, DC. 19 April. 2002. [Online] Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>

James, Judith R. *Networking Forum with California Community College Staff.* Presentation at CalWORKs Partnership Conference, San Diego, CA. 18 December. 2001.

Johnston, Patrick. *California Senate Bill 1744. Regional Workforce Preparation and Economic Development Act.* Sacramento, CA. 1998. [Online] Available at <http://www.regcolab.cahwnet.gov/rcllegsb.pdf>

Martinson, Karin. & Strawn, Julie. *Built to Last: Why Skills Matter for Long-run Success in Welfare Reform.* Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington, D.C. May. 2002. [Online] Available at <http://www.clasp.org/DMS/Documents/1021310826.2/Built_to_Last_final_051302.pdf>

Mathur, Anita. *Credentials Count: How California's Community Colleges Help Parents Move from Welfare to Self-sufficiency.* Prepared for the California Community College Chancellor's Office by the Center for Law and Social Policy. Washington, D.C. May. 2002. [Online] Available at <http://www.clasp.org/DMS/Documents/1021060885.68/Credentials_Count_final.pdf >

Nussbaum, Thomas. *Weekly Email Update.* Sacramento, CA. 4 March. 2002.

Nussbaum,T., Johnson,G., Eastin,D., and Hatamiya,L. *Memorandum of Understanding between California Community Colleges, Health and Human Services, California Department of Education and California Department of Trade and Commerce.* Sacramento, CA January. 2000. [Online] Available at: <http://www.regcolab.cahwnet.gov/rclpf.htm>

State Policy Documentation Project. State Time Limits on TANF Cash Assistance. Washington, DC. June.2000. [Online] Available at: <http://www.spdp.org/tanf/timelimit.htm>

Thompson, Jane. *Informal Survey of CalWORKs Programs.* Solano Community College, CA 2002.

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
428 J STREET, SUITE 430, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
916/445.4753 HTTP://WWW.ACADEMICSENATE.CC.CA.US

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").